PTO/SB/21(08/00)
Approved for use through 19/30/2000. OMB 0651-0031
Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Application Number	09/141,210
Filing Date	August 27, 1998
First Named Inventor	Phillip E. Mattison
Group Art Unit	2621
Examiner Name	Y. Kassa
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	38
Attorney Docket Number	42390P4817

ENCLOSURES *(check all that apply)*

- [X] Fee Transmittal Form
  - [X] Fee Attached
- [ ] Amendment / Response
  - [ ] After Final
  - [ ] Affidavits/declaration(s)
- [ ] Extension of Time Request
- [ ] Express Abandonment Request
- [ ] Information Disclosure Statement
- [ ] Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)
- [ ] Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application
  - [ ] Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53
- [ ] Assignment Papers *(for an Application)*
- [ ] Drawing(s)
- [ ] Licensing-related Papers
- [ ] Petition
- [ ] Petition to Convert a Provisional Application
- [ ] Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address
- [ ] Terminal Disclaimer
- [ ] Request for Refund
- [ ] CD, Number of CD(s)_____
- [ ] After Allowance Communication to Group
- [ ] Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
- [X] Appeal Communication to Group *(Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)*
- [ ] Proprietary Information
- [ ] Status Letter
- [X] Other Enclosure(s) *(please identify below):*

-Check in the amount of $310.00 for the Appeal Brief
Appeal Brief (19 pages) submitted in triplicate
-Postcard

Remarks

"Postcript Language Reference," third edition (4 pgs.) (Add'l Attachments)
"What is Object-Oriented Software?" (4 pgs.)
U.S. PTO database printout - 5 pgs.
Online Computing Dictionary - 1 pg.

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm or Individual name	Raul D. Martinez, Reg. No. 46,904 BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
Signature	Raul D Mat
Date	May 2, 2001

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on this date: **May 2, 2001**

Typed or printed name	Lillian E. Rodriguez		
Signature	Lillian E. Rodriguez	Date	05/02/01

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

PTO/SB/17 (09-00)
Approved for use through 10/31/2002. OMB 0651-0032
Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

FEE TRANSMITTAL for FY 2001

Petent fees are subject to annual revision.

TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT ($) 310.00

Complete If Known	
Application Number	09/141,210
Filing Date	08/27/98
First Named Inventor	Phillip E. Mattison
Examiner Name	Y. Kassa
Group Art Unit	2621
Attorney Docket Number	42390P4817

OIPE JC173 MAY 07 2001 PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED MAY 9 - 2001 Technology Center 2600

METHOD OF PAYMENT (check one)

1. ☒ The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge indicated fees and credit any over payments to:

Deposit Account Number: 02-2666

Deposit Account Name: Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP

☒ Charge Any Additional Fee Required Under 37CFR 1.16 and 1.17

☐ Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27

2. ☒ Payment Enclosed:

☒ Check ☐ Money Order ☐ Other

FEE CALCULATION

1. FILING FEE

Large Entity Fee Code	Large Entity Fee ($)	Small Entity Fee Code	Small Entity Fee ($)	Fee Description	Fee Paid
101	710	201	355	Utility filing fee	
106	320	206	160	Design filing fee	
107	490	207	245	Plant filing fee	
108	710	208	355	Reissue filing fee	
114	150	214	75	Provisional filing fee	

SUBTOTAL (1) ($)

2. CLAIMS

		Extra		Fee from below		Fee Paid
Total Claims	21 -	=	X		=	
Independent Claims	5 -	=	X		=	
					=	

Multiple Dependent Claims

Large Entity Fee Code	Large Entity Fee ($)	Small Entity Fee Code	Small Entity Fee ($)	Fee Description
103	18	203	9	Claims in excess of 20
102	80	202	40	Independent claims in excess of 3
104	270	204	135	Multiple Dependent claim
109	80	209	40	Reissue independent claims over original patent
110	18	210	9	Reissue claims in excess of 20 and over original patent

SUBTOTAL (2) ($)

**or number previously paid, if greater; For Reissues, see above

FEE CALCULATION (continued)

3. ADDITIONAL FEE

Large Entity Fee Code	Large Entity Fee ($)	Small Entity Fee Code	Small Entity Fee ($)	Fee Description	Fee Paid
105	130	205	65	Surcharge - late filing fee or oath	
127	50	227	25	Surcharge - late provisional filing fee or cover sheet.	
139	130	139	130	Non-English specification	
147	2,520	147	2,520	For filing a request for *ex parte* reexamination	
112	920*	112	920*	Requesting publication of SIR prior to Examiner action	
113	1,840*	113	1,840*	Requesting publication of SIR after Examiner action	
115	110	215	55	Extension for response within first month	
116	390	216	195	Extension for response within second month	
117	890	217	445	Extension for response within third month	
118	1,390	218	695	Extension for response within fourth month	
128	1,890	228	945	Extension for response within fifth month	
119	310	219	155	Notice of Appeal	
120	310	220	155	Filing a brief in support of an appeal	310
121	270	221	135	Request for oral hearing	
138	1,510	138	1,510	Petition to institute a public use proceeding	
140	110	240	55	Petition to revive - unavoidably	
141	1,240	241	620	Petition to revive - unintentionally	
142	1,240	242	620	Utility issue fee (or reissue)	
143	440	243	220	Design issue fee	
144	600	244	300	Plant issue fee	
122	130	122	130	Petitions to the Commissioner	
123	50	123	50	Petitions related to provisional applications	
126	180	126	180	Submission of Information Disclosure Stmt	
581	40	581	40	Recording each patent assignment per property (times number of properties)	
146	710	246	355	Filing a submission after final rejection (37 CFR 1.129(a))	
149	710	249	355	For each additional invention to be examined (37 CFR 1.129(b))	
179	710	279	355	Request for Continued Examination (RCE)	
169	900	169	900	Request for expedited examination of a design application	

Other fee (specify) _____

* Reduced by Basic Filing Fee Paid

SUBTOTAL (3) ($) 310.00

SUBMITTED BY				Complete (if applicable)	
Typed or Printed Name	Raul D. Martinez, Reg. No. 46,904			Reg. Number	
Signature	Raul D Mart	Date	5/2/2001	Deposit Account User ID	02-2666

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Box Patent Application, Washington, DC 20231.

#17
5/11/01

Attorney's Docket No.: 42390P4817

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application for:

Phillip E. Mattison

Serial No.: 09/141,210

Filed: August 27, 1998

For: **IMPROVING THE PORTABILITY OF DIGITAL IMAGES**

Examiner: Yosef Kassa

Art Group: 2621

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.192

Dear Sir:

Applicant submits, in triplicate, the following Appeal Brief pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.192 for consideration by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (hereinafter referred to as "Board"). Applicant also submits herewith a check in the amount of $310.00 to cover the cost of filing this Brief. Please charge any additional amount due or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 02-2666.

05/09/2001 RWONDAF1 00000018 09141210
01 FC:120 310.00 OP

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest with regard to this appeal is Intel Corporation.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no other appeals or interferences known to the undersigned that will directly affect, be directly affected by, or have a bearing upon the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application, all of which stand rejected. Claims 1-21 are on appeal.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendments have been submitted. The Appendix contains the claims as currently pending.

SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

Applicant's invention pertains to the art of digital imaging and, more specifically, to techniques of packaging digital images that may be in different native formats and translating them into a common format.

An embodiment of the invention provides a technique that allows different types of imaging devices that store digital images in different native formats to

communicate with a host computer system to allow the viewing or processing of such images in a common format aboard the host. Initially, image data is stored as part of an object, with each object containing image data and an associated method in the classical sense of object-oriented programming. For example, the method is the intelligence necessary to support a translation from a native format of the imaging device to a common image file format (Specification, p. 5, lines 2-13). On the host computer, the method can be executed in an interpreter. Thus, the same method can run on any machine that also has an interpreter, which means that the host computer is not dependent on the native format of the imaging device. Methods can advantageously be small because they are specific to image processing. In addition, the interpreter protects the host system from viruses.

Referring to Applicant's **Fig. 1**, an image capture device **104a**, **104b** (or an image storage device **110**) forms image data into an object in the classical sense of objected-oriented software (Specification, p. 5, lines 7-9; p. 6, lines 4-7). Each object **108a**, **108b**, or **108c** includes at least one data portion that is the image data in the native format of the image device (Specification, p. 6, lines 7-9 and Fig. 1) and a method (**115a**, **115b**, and **115c**) for translating the native format into a common image file format on the host computer system (Specification, p. 5, lines 10-13 and Fig. 1).

Once the objects are transferred to the host computer system **102**, their methods are interpreted and executed by the abstract machine **120**, resulting in data files **116a** (from object **108a**), **116b$_1$** and **116b$_2$** (from object **108b**), and **116c** (from

object **108c**). These files will contain digital images in a predefined common format. The data files may then be accessed and manipulated by application **124** (Specification, p. 6, lines 14-19 and Fig. 1). Thus, image data from different imaging devices with unique native formats may be translated to a common format on the host system with the use of objects (image data and an associated method for translating the data).

GROUPING OF THE CLAIMS

Applicant wishes that the claims do not stand or fall together. Rather, the claims are to be grouped as follows:

Group 1: Claims 1-4 and 7-9 stand or fall together.

Group 2: Claims 5-6 and 20-21 stand or fall together.

Group 3: Claims 10-14, 16 and 19 stand or fall together.

Group 4: Claims 15, 17, and 18 stand or fall together.

Each claim group is deemed separately patentable for reasons given below.

ISSUES PRESENTED

The issues presented in this Appeal are as follows:

(1) Whether claims 1-14, 16, and 19-21 are anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,982,994 to Mori, et al. ("Mori"); and

(2) Whether claims 15, 17, and 18 are obvious over Mori in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,873,077 to Kanoh, et al. ("Kanoh").

ARGUMENT

I. Group 1: Rejection of Claims 1-4 and 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

It is axiomatic that to anticipate a claim, every element of the claim must be disclosed within a single reference. Applicant submits that the Examiner has failed in this regard.

Among other limitations, Applicant's Claim 1 recites associating first image data and first method as part of an image object, the first method for being executed by an abstract machine to obtain first translated image data based upon the first image (emphasis added).

In making the rejection, the Examiner relies on Mori, which discloses a network printer apparatus which has emulation programs for interpreting different types of page description languages. When the page description language is transferred to the apparatus, it is interpreted using the appropriate emulation program (i.e., a PostScript® or PCL interpreter) (Abstract and Col. 13, lines 5-13). To put the cited portions of Mori in context, Applicant refers to ADOBE SYSTEMS, INC., POSTSCRIPT® LANGUAGE REFERENCE 14 (3rd ed. 1999) ("Adobe"), which describes a page description language as a language for expressing a high-level imaging model. "A high-level imaging model enables an application to describe the appearance of pages containing text, graphical shapes, and sampled images in terms of abstract graphical elements rather than in terms of [device-dependent] device pixels." Adobe, page 14. An application program uses a high-level imaging model to produce printed output

in two stages. First, the application generates a device-independent description of the output in a page description language (i.e., PostScript® or PCL). Second, the raster output device renders the image by interpreting the description. Adobe, page 14.

Thus, Mori does not disclose an object-oriented framework wherein image objects have associated translation methods. The apparatus in Mori accepts printer data that contains either a PostScript® or a PCL program (Col. 13, line 9). However, PostScript® and PCL are not object-oriented languages.

Rather, an object-oriented language manipulates objects. See, e.g., Terry Montlick, *What is Object-Oriented Software?*, http://catalog.com/softinfo/objects.html (1999) ("Montlick"). An object is a data type that is comprised of data and associated methods for operating on the data. An object's data and methods are indivisible. Methods provide a high-level interface that hides the underlying implementation details of the data (Montlick, page 1).

A PostScript® program consists of a commingled series of PostScript® operators, procedure definitions, operands and data (Adobe, page 17). POSTSCRIPT® data and operators/procedures are separate entities – they are not indivisible. Therefore, the POSTSCRIPT® language is not object-oriented. Likewise, a PCL is not object-oriented since PCL programs contain "both print function commands and interspersed print data" (Background Section, U.S. Patent No. 5,706,410 to Bagley, et al.).

Thus, Mori does not disclose the object-oriented approach recited in Claim 1 by the limitation "associating first image data and first method as part of an image object, the first

method for being executed by an abstract machine to obtain first translated image data based upon the first image". Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 1 must be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 2-4, these claims are not anticipated by Mori for at least the same reasons given in connection with their base Claim 1. Therefore, the rejection of Claims 2-4 must be withdrawn.

Among other limitations, Applicant's Claim 7 recites transferring an image object having first image data associated with a first method to a processing system; and an abstract machine in said processing system executing the first method for generating first translated image data based upon the first image data (emphasis added).

The Examiner contends that Mori discloses all of the limitations of Applicant's Claim 7 for the same reasons given in connection with Claim 1. Claim 7 recites operations at least some of which are similar to those that can be performed by the article of Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 7 is not anticipated by the relied upon prior art for at least the same reasons given in connection with Claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 7 must be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 8 and 9, these claims are not anticipated by Mori for at least the same reasons given in connection with their base Claim 7. Therefore, the rejection of Claims 8 and 9 must be withdrawn.

II. Group 2: Rejection of Claims 5-6 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Among other limitations, Applicant's Claim 5 recites an abstract machine executing the corresponding methods of each object to obtain first and second translated image data based upon the first and second image data, respectively (emphasis added).

Claim 5 recites operations at least some of which are similar to those that can be performed by the article of Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 5 is not anticipated by Mori for at least the same reasons given in connection with Claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 5 must be withdrawn.

In addition, Claim 5 recites configuring a data processing system to receive first and second objects from first and second imaging devices, respectively, the objects having first and second image data and corresponding methods...(emphasis added).

Mori discloses a multi-protocol network printer apparatus having emulation programs for interpreting different types of page description languages (i.e., PostScript®, PCL, etc.) (Abstract and Col. 13, lines 5-13). As explained in regards to Claim 1, PostScript® and PCL are not object-oriented languages. Since the printer in Mori receives PostScript® or PCL programs, it therefore does not receive objects from imaging devices. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 5 must be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 6, this claim is not anticipated by Mori for at least the same reasons given in connection with its base Claim 5. Therefore, the rejection of Claim 6 must be withdrawn.

Among other limitations, Applicant's Claim 20 recites configuring the system to receive first and second objects from first and second imaging devices, respectively, each object having image data and a corresponding method; and an abstract machine executing the corresponding method of each object to obtain corresponding translated data based upon the image data (emphasis added).

Claim 20 recites operations at least some of which are similar to those that can be performed by the article of Claim 5. Therefore, Claim 20 is not anticipated by Mori for at least the same reasons given in connection with Claim 5. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 20 must be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 21, this claim is not anticipated by Mori for at least the same reasons given in connection with its base Claim 20. Therefore, the rejection of Claim 21 must be withdrawn.

III. Group 3: Rejection of Claims 10-14, 16 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Among other limitations, Applicant's Claim 10 recites memory for storing an image object having first image data being related to the sensor data and first image method for being executed by an abstract machine to obtain translated first image data based upon the first image data (emphasis added).

Claim 10 recites operations at least some of which are similar to those that can be performed by the article of Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 10 is not anticipated by Mori for at

least the same reasons given in connection with Claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 10 must be withdrawn.

In addition, Applicant's Claim 10 recites an imaging device comprising an image sensor for generating sensor data; and memory for storing an image object having first image data being related to the sensor data...(emphasis added).

Mori discloses a multi-protocol network printer apparatus, not an image sensor (Abstract). The printer in Mori can print PostScript® or PCL files (Col. 13, lines 5-13). For instance, the printing mechanism 23 in Mori's Fig. 1 is used to render raster images generated by the interpretation of PostScript® or PCL programs onto a printed page (Col. 6, lines 53-67). Although the printer apparatus in Mori contains various sensors for detecting the passage of paper, these sensors do not generate image data for subsequent storage in an image object (Col. 12, line 14 and Fig. 9, part 6b-5). Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 10 must be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 11-14, 16, and 19, these claims are not anticipated by Mori for at least the same reasons given in connection with their base Claim 10. Therefore, the rejection of Claims 11-14, 16, and 19 must be withdrawn.

IV. Group 4: Rejection of Claims 15, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejects Claims 15, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Mori in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,873,077 to Kanoh, et al. ("Kanoh"). The Examiner's

obligation in making a *prima facie* case of obviousness requires the Examiner to show that the cited references in combination teach or suggest all elements of the claimed invention.

Mori discloses a multi-protocol network printer apparatus (Abstract). The printer in Mori can print PostScript® or PCL files (Col. 13, lines 5-13). As mentioned previously, the printing mechanism 23 in Mori's Fig. 1 is used to render raster images generated by the interpretation of PostScript® or PCL programs onto a printed page (Col. 6, lines 53-67).

Kanoh discloses a method and apparatus for searching for and retrieving documents using a facsimile machine (Abstract). A user can perform a web-based textual search by filling in search terms on a form and faxing the form to a gateway machine. The gateway machine performs character recognition on the received search form to extract search terms, initiates a web-based query based on the search terms, and then faxes the results back to the user (Kanoh, Fig. 2).

Applicant's Claim 15 recites the imaging device of Claim 14 wherein the logic circuitry performs a color interpolation algorithm on the sensor data.

In regards to Claim 15, neither Mori nor Kanoh teach or suggest performing a color interpolation algorithm on sensor data. In Mori, while the printer apparatus contains various sensors for detecting the passage of paper, these sensors do not generate data for subsequent color interpolation (Col. 12, line 14 and Mori, Fig. 9, part 6b-5). Likewise, the gateway 102 of Kanoh receives images from one or more fax modems, not integrated image sensors (Col. 13, lines 36-44). Furthermore, rather than perform a color interpolation on the faxed image,

the gateway 102 paints the entire image a single color (e.g., black) except for circled regions to make detecting circled regions easier (Col. 13, lines 36-45 and Fig. 8).

Since neither Mori nor Kanoh teach or suggest logic circuitry to perform a color interpolation algorithm on sensor data, they cannot be combined to do so. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 15 must be withdrawn.

Applicant's Claim 17 recites the imaging device of Claim 10 wherein the image object comprises a TIFF file, the TIFF file comprising the first image data and the first image method (emphasis added).

In regards to Claim 17, neither Mori nor Kanoh teach or suggest image objects with associated methods. Mori discloses a multi-protocol printer that accepts PostScript® or PCL programs, neither of which is object-oriented. Kanoh describes a means for searching the web by faxing search requests to a gateway server. Facsimile machines exchange bitmaps via Tagged Image File Format ("TIFF") files which have no associated methods (Col. 15, lines 15-20; and definition of "TIFF" in Online Computer Dictionary, http://www.instantweb.com/d/dictionary/foldoc.cgi?query=tiff).

Since neither Mori nor Kanoh teach or suggest image objects with associated methods they cannot be combined to do so. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 17 must be withdrawn.

Applicant's Claim 18 recites the imaging device of Claim 10 wherein the translated first image data is part of an image file being in the Device Independent Bitmap (DIB) format (emphasis added).

In regards to Claim 18, neither Mori nor Kanoh teach or suggest a translated (by way of a method included in an object) image file being in DIB Format. The interpreter in Mori does not translate image data by way of a method included in an object, but rather, Mori translates PostScript® or PCL files to a device-specific raster image for rendering on a printer drum, which is not device independent. Likewise, Kanoh does not teach or suggest translation of images (with a method included in an object) into a device independent bitmap format. Rather, Kanoh extracts bitmaps (e.g. no translation with a method included in an object) from the search form and creates a search query from recognized search terms (Col. 8, lines 34-55).

Since neither Mori nor Kanoh teach or suggest translation (with a method included in an object) of an image file in DIB format, they cannot be combined to do so. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 18 must be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-21 are not anticipated or obvious in view of the cited references because neither of the cited references teach or suggest translation of image data with a method included in an object. Therefore, Claims 1-21 should be allowed to issue in their present form.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 5/2/01 By: Raul D Martinez

Raul D. Martinez
Reg. No. 46,904

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(310) 207-3800

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on May 2, 2001.

Lillian E. Rodriguez 5-2-01

Lillian E. Rodriguez *Date*

APPENDIX

1. An article comprising:

a machine-readable medium having instructions that when executed by a processor cause the step of

associating first image data and first method as part of an image object, the first method for being executed by an abstract machine to obtain first translated image data based upon the first image.

2. The article of claim 1 wherein the machine readable medium further comprises instructions that when executed by the processor cause the further step of:

associating second image data with the first method as part of the object, the first method for being executed by the abstract machine to obtain second translated image data based upon the second image data.

3. The article of claim 1 wherein the machine readable medium further comprises instructions that when executed by the processor cause the further step of:

associating second image data and second method as part of a second object, the second method for being executed by the abstract machine to obtain second translated image data based upon the second image data.

4. The article of claim 1 wherein the first translated data is in the same format as the first data.

5. An article comprising

a machine-readable medium having instructions that when executed by a processor cause the steps of

configuring a data processing system to receive first and second objects from first and second imaging devices, respectively, the objects having first and second image data and corresponding methods; and

an abstract machine executing the corresponding methods of each object to obtain first and second translated image data based upon the first and second image data, respectively.

6. The article of claim 5 wherein the first and second translated image data are in the same image file format.

7. A method comprising:

transferring an image object having first image data associated with a first method to a processing system; and

an abstract machine in said processing system executing the first method for generating first translated image data based upon the first image data.

8. The method of claim 7 further comprising:

transferring a second object having second image data associated with a second method to the processing system, the first and second image data being in different formats; and

the abstract machine executing the second method generating second translated image data based upon the second image data, the first and second translated image data being in the same format.

9. The method of claim 7 further comprising:

transferring second image data associated with the first method to the processing system; and

the abstract machine executing the first method generating second translated image data based upon the second image data, the first and second translated image data being in the same format.

10. An imaging device comprising:

image sensor for generating sensor data; and

memory for storing an image object having first image data being related to the sensor data and first image method for being executed by an abstract machine to obtain translated first image data based upon the first image data.

11. The imaging device of claim 10 wherein the first image data is the sensor data.

12. The imaging device of claim 10 further comprising

a processor; and

second memory having instructions that when executed by the processor cause processing the sensor data into the first image data.

13. The imaging device of claim 12 wherein the processing comprises performing an image processing methodology on the sensor data.

14. The imaging device of claim 10 further comprising:

logic circuitry for processing the sensor data into the first image data.

15. The imaging device of claim 14 wherein the logic circuitry performs a color interpolation algorithm on the sensor data.

16. The imaging device of claim 10 further comprising:

interface to a communication medium for transferring the first image data and the first method to a processing system separate from the imaging device, the processing system being configured with said abstract machine.

17. The imaging device of claim 10 wherein the image object comprises a TIFF file, the TIFF file comprising the first image data and the first image method.

18. The imaging device of claim 10 wherein the translated first image data is part of an image file being in the Device Independent Bitmap (DIB) format.

19. The imaging device of claim 10 wherein the first image data and the translated first image data have the same image file format.

20. A data processing system comprising:

a processor;

memory coupled to the processor and having instructions that when executed by the processor cause the steps of

configuring the system to receive first and second objects from first and second imaging devices, respectively, each object having image data and a corresponding method; and

an abstract machine executing the corresponding method of each object to obtain corresponding translated data based upon the image data.

21. The system of claim 20 wherein

the translated data are part of first and second image files having the same image file format.